

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
(916) 263-5506
(916) 263-0594 FAX
INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov



Seismic Safety Commission
AB 16 Advisory Committee
Minutes of Meeting
July 24, 2002
Courtyard by Marriott, South Natomas
Sacramento, CA

Members Present

Commissioner Stan Moy, *Chair*
Commissioner Bill Gates
Commissioner Dan Shapiro (*via phone*)
Commissioner Andrew Adelman (*via phone*)
Thomas Duffy, CASH
Steve Newsom, CDE
Abe Hajela, CSBA
Gary McGavin, AIA
Dick Phillips, EERI
Dennis Bellet, DSA
David Clinchy, Los Rios Comm. Coll. District
Gini Krippner, CDF, State Fire Marshal's Office

Members Absent

Bill Holmes, SEAOC

Staff Present

Henry Reyes
Richard McCarthy
Fred Turner
Henry Sepulveda
Karen Cogan
Adam Myers
Abby Browning

Interested Guests Present

Melissa Fong, Asm. Frommer's Office
Gin Yang-Staehlin, Chancellor's Office,
CA Comm. Coll.
Patti Heerhartz, DSA
Mark Christian, AIA
Jeff Bell, DOF

I. Call to Order/ Introductions

Chairman Moy called the meeting to order at 10:05am. He welcomed everyone to the committee and all members introduced themselves.

Chairman Moy would like the minutes to reflect that the committee meetings will be operated under a consensus building methodology. If necessary, Robert's rules will be used. Then decisions, resolutions, and recommendations will go forward as motions and will be recorded as a numerical decision.

II. Scope of Work

Mr. Reyes explained the scope of work to the committee. He described what the committee is to address under AB 16, and items that are not to be covered. Items not to be covered are, costs and cost-effectiveness of seismic retrofits, and the necessity of, or alternatives to the Field Act. He said the intent is to get **equivalent safety compliance**, not substantial or general compliance. Mr. Reyes referred to bullets that were listed in the handout.

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
(916) 263-5506
(916) 263-0594 FAX
INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov



Mr. Tom Duffy commented that, “state financing policies for schools does not today include the ability to take a non-field act building, and do new state construction on that building or modernization to bring it into compliance with the Field Act.” ‘Perhaps the committee’s recommendations could include that the state of California could finance this through one of the programs as a proposed policy statement.’

Mr. Duffy proposed that the Committee’s document be connected with a funding policy recommendation.

Mr. McCarthy suggested that this would be appropriate at the end of the document in “recommendations” to the Division of the State Architect.

Mr. Reyes continued to outline the proposed scope of work, to which there were no objections by the committee. He recommended that the next three meetings be scheduled so that the stakeholders, design professionals, school officials, building owners and facilities managers would be heard.

Mr. Reyes went on to discuss the two items that are outside the scope of work. Those are the costs of seismic retrofits and alternatives to the Field Act. The main objective is meeting equivalent pupil safety performance standard requirements.

Discussion was held about the scope of the work, and it was clear that this product must be easily understood, rational, short and simple. The committee looked over the proposed scope of work.

Mr. McGavin suggested that Mr. Tom Blurock be invited to speak to the committee because he worked with a school in Pomona, which was formally a shopping center.

Discussion was held by the committee about possible locations and speakers for the following meetings.

III. Draft Product Outline

Mr. Reyes introduced the draft product outline, which was provided for the committee in the handout. It is patterned after the Commission’s Hospital Seismic Safety Findings, 2001.

Mr. Jeff Bell expressed the expectations of the Department of Finance and the Administration. He said that the Department wants to see what went into the analysis that led to the conclusions by the committee. After reviewing previous work on this issue, they have not been convinced that they have seen a substantial amount of rigorous analysis. He re-iterated that it is very important to have an independent analysis from the Seismic Safety Commission.

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
(916) 263-5506
(916) 263-0594 FAX
INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov



A discussion was then held on the difference between equivalent, and equally safe buildings.

The Committee then re-iterated how important it was to be concise with the findings and analysis. The different issues can be addressed in the recommendations section.

IV. Scheduling

A discussion was held on date, location, and the topic of each meeting. The committee agreed on the following:

- August 15, Pomona, CA ~ Design professionals and Researchers (one or more case studies)
- September 19, San Diego ~ Stake holders
- October 17, Oakland ~ Equivalent Earthquake Safety Performance Standards
- November 21, Sacramento ~ Final Draft Findings

Commissioner Gates stated that the Commission has asked him to edit the document and make sure the committee does what the bill requires. This document must be understood by the average person.

Discussions were then held on the difference between **equivalent and equally safe** buildings. The committee agreed that this difference must be made clear.

It was agreed upon that the definitions should be looked at in the document.

Mr. Bellet pointed out that the committee is looking for the **equivalent safety performance**.

Mr. Bell said that the intent would be, that retrofitted buildings that perform like the Field Act schools, be restored in **weeks to months**. The Statute is silence on this aspect.

Mr. Bellet said that it is possible that, “property protection might be more costly and difficult to write regulations for than life safety protection.”

Mr. Bell said that, “the Administration needs to know that.” The Administration also wants to know that the buildings are equally safe and that there is a minimum amount of time before the building can be re-utilized.

Chairman Moy said that equivalent safety and minimum down time, including the ability to use schools after disasters, is important. These buildings would be similar to other Field Act schools.

V. Presentation by the Division of the State Architect

Mr. Bellet began his presentation by distributing a handout. He then used this as an outline for his presentation on IR A-1.

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100
SACRAMENTO, CA 95833
(916) 263-5506
(916) 263-0594 FAX
INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov



He commented that the Field Act requires personal knowledge of the construction of the schools in every respect. The IR A-1 only requires verification and general compliance.

Mr. Bellet also commented on Inspection. He said that continuous equivalence is difficult to verify. Normal Field Act building inspectors spend two hundred plus days per project. He asked if there was a way to define equivalent inspection?

He then went on to speak on the need for a certification box. A new set of regulations is needed. He commented that the current practice for IR A-1 is in the handout. The letter attached is in lieu of certification required by the Field Act.

Mr. Bellet suggested that this proposal would be fundamentally different than IR A-1. He proposes to focus on those locations in the building likely to be highly stressed and vulnerable to damage, and verify construction there.

Chairman Moy suggested that DSA needs to develop assumptions based on reasonable practices, and overcome the fact that we will never be able to certify with certainty.

Mr. Bellet responded that the need is to bring the confidence level to the same level of confidence accepted for new Field Act construction, because they currently don't test every aspect.

Mr. Abe Hajela commented that DSA's current process relies on a personal judgment whereas in this proposal, standards would be developed. He then asked if Mr. Bellet thought that standards could be developed.

Mr. Bellet answered that since the Northridge Earthquake, knowledge in this field has increased and in his opinion, the standards can be developed.

Discussions on Mr. Bellet's presentation concluded and Chairman Moy thanked him for his input.

Chairman Moy commented on the success of the first meeting and his gratitude for the frankness that the committee members are bringing to the table.

Mr. Reyes mentioned that meeting notices and minutes will be emailed to each participant.

Meeting adjourned by unanimous vote at 1:50pm.

SEISMIC SAFETY COMMISSION

1755 CREEKSIDE OAKS DRIVE, SUITE 100

SACRAMENTO, CA 95833

(916) 263-5506

(916) 263-0594 FAX

INTERNET: www.seismic.ca.gov

